

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/760,197	ALOISE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	C. SAYALA	1761

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) C. SAYALA.

(3) Mr John Uren, attorney.

(2) Mr Saxby.

(4) Mr Aloise.

Date of Interview: 20 August 2003

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

pending

Claims discussed:

1-15

Prior art documents discussed:

as applied

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant stated that the liquid media acts as "a platform" in providing co-factors for the enzyme. He also stated that the disclosure that the krill hydrolysate provides incomplete hydrolysis was in error in the WO '498. Nonetheless, applicant was informed that the new limitation as to the krill hydrolysate being the liquid media does not occur in the specification, as originally filed. Applicant stated that if the case was found not allowable he will appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences. No resolution was reached. An office action will be sent out.